BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08654 220 4

PRESENTED TO THE ~~29916~~ 29916

7588.202

Public Library of the City of Boston

SIT DEUS NOBIS PATRIBUS SIT PATRIBUS DEUS NOBIS

BOSTONIA
CONDITA AD
1630.

CIVITATIS REGIMINE DUNTA A.D. 1822

By Elizur Wright, Esq.
Received Sept. 4, 1860. No. 41881

FORM NO. 609; 6,12.33; 575M.

Boston Public Library

Do not write in this book or mark it with pen or pencil. Penalties for so doing are imposed by the Revised Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This book was issued to the borrower on the date last stamped below.

AUG 10 1953

AN EYE OPENER

41881

FOR THE

WIDE AWAKES.

7588.20

BY ELIZUR WRIGHT.

A union-saving, constitutional, conservative, law-and-order, right-side-up-with-care, unblushing, unquivering, unsectional, Zouave-drill, Garibaldian, up-to-the-times Abolitionist.

BOSTON:
THAYER & ELDRIDGE,
114 & 116 WASHINGTON ST.
1860.

Other ed. No. 1 in 4310.60, etc.

41881

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1860, by
ELIZUR WRIGHT,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

AN EYE OPENER

FOR THE

WIDE AWAKES.

Bless your young hearts — you of the fresh, new generation, the blossoming future America,—the America which is to decide whether Liberty or Slavery shall be universal,— you are "waked up." Good! I am so glad of it! My own eyes were partially peeled a good many years ago, and as I have been growing grey since—though in spite of that I feel younger every year I live — it has really seemed to me that my fellow-citizens, to wit, nearly all of the white people of the Northern States, and all but a hundred thousand or so of the Southern, differ from our canine friends only in this, that age does not open their eyes. If not born, like the darling little dogs, blind, they seem as soon as born to be dressed with bandages over their eyes never to be taken off, and to be used in that condition, old and young, venerable and simple, whenever occasion requires, to snuff after, bark at and worry down the four millions of poor black people whom the other hundred thousand Southerners have made up their dignified minds to keep at work forever,

without wages. One has instinctively, unless his eyes are too closely bandaged to allow his brains to breed instincts, insuperable objections to being so used; objections of which one of the smallest is sympathy with black people, though a man fit to keep company with a dog would not be ashamed of that.

You are wide awake, you say. Of course you don't believe in bandages. There is nothing in the whole horizon, or looming out of the future, which you think it unsafe to look at, or to take into account in making up your minds as to what is what. That's right. But keep rubbing your eyes, for it is early in the morning with some of you, and perhaps they will open wider — wide enough to see your political way at first hand, and not take it altogether from old lawyers who have read law till they have forgotten Blackstone, or old politicians who have squinted in taking their aim till they have lost sight of the mark, and can only see their own precious noses.

It is so comfortable to have a set of social, political and moral principles which don't depend at all on other people, and so plain and straight withal as not to get tangled and kinked up in the application, that I cannot help commending to your notice some of mine. Mind, though offered freely, I do not insist on your taking them. When I know I have genuine coin of the Republic in my pocket I don't feel hurt in the least if anybody declines to take it as a gift. Abstain totally, my friends, if you please. I don't force this money on anybody, rather guessing there will be enough willing to take it, by and by. Perhaps your pockets are already full. All right. Then I only advise you to keep them so. A handful of the principles to which I refer, taken in the abstract, and at hap-

hazard, are such as these — and they are just as good in my opinion, *mutatis mutandis*, for a nation, or a party, or a part of a nation, as for an individual.

A SAMPLE OF PRINCIPLES.

If you *must* hurt, rob or wrong somebody, don't do it to the weak, but pick out a victim at least as big as yourself. Do that for the sweet sake of respecting yourself, if for nothing else.

If you have sworn to wrong yourself, be stuffy and keep the oath as strictly as you possibly can during the coëxistence of its and your natural life. But never swear to wrong anybody else, and if you have been so unlucky as to do it, or if you have sworn to help somebody else do it, or somebody else has sworn so for you, don't keep the oath one minute, but abjure and break it as soon as ever you can. Oaths, my dear boy, are things too sacred and holy to be used in favor of *known* wickedness. So if you have sworn to rob a poor woman's hen-roost, don't you do it, no, not even if your ancestors swore the same oath back to the flood.

Answer kind people kindly, and civil people civilly; but if civilly dressed and smooth-spoken scoundrels tell you that the future peace, and welfare, and glory of mankind, or any portion thereof, are to be promoted by your quietly letting them, or anybody, rob and wrong people who are not strong enough to prevent it—whatever you do, don't you go about meekly ashamed of the little virtue you have, and calmly and humbly apologizing for any views and feelings that naturally arise in your mind to the contrary of such doctrines and practices. It is morally unhealthy.

God created human arrogance — the proud eye that tames the horse, the elephant, the lion — for some higher use than merely maintaining dominion over brutes; and certainly not exclusively for the use of people who desire to wrong their fellow-men. Why should those who know they are trying to do right feel or act bashfully or expect that the right will prosper, in a case more difficult than tiger-taming, by their so doing?

Non-intervention is a very good motto for wickedly inclined people, and one cannot but wish they would manacle their own mischievous hands with it at once, but for honest, well-disposed people, it is synonymous with *non-sense.* Good government is nothing but the intervention of the good against wrong. When a government, anywhere on this planet, becomes nothing but an intervention of the bad against right, it will doubtless be thankful to the good everywhere for not intervening, and pay them by destroying their rights as soon as it is able. If a good man can swear that his intervention shall never extend beyond a given geographical line, what hinders him from swearing that line into a circle, including only NUMBER ONE?

Being one of those who think the smallest truth is, in the long run,—and how terribly long the run sometimes has to be! — more than a match for the strongest man, or any number of strong men, and not believing at all that the welfare of so large a country as America, or any other real and permanent welfare can be promoted by swearing to a political absurdity, or sticking to the oath when sworn, the writer offers these few remarks, with a truly unassuming and modest arrogance — that is to say.

an arrogance belonging to the subject and not to the man, —only to those who have eyes to see, and ears to hear. Others are affectionately warned not to read another word, but to shut up the book and burn it, for they can only be damaged, poisoned, and made to feel unhappy and disagreeable by going through. The writer's sympathies with the Republican Party, so far as it has any thing positive in its programme, in relation to the main issue before the country, are intense — even uncomfortably so. But that party, he must confess,—and why should he hide it when the party itself takes no pains to do so? — has also a negative side in relation to that issue, shown to an admiring universe on great occasions, with a grim solemnity reminding one of the faces worn by the Grand Lama, Pontifex Maximus, most Holy Father, or other stupendous personifications of humbug, in times and places where simple solemnity has been a power in the world. And since this negative side is, in the writer's honest opinion, not only in its own essence, made up of either ignorance, cant, or cowardice, but logically destructive of the positive principles of the party, and sure to make it in some measure contemptible in the eyes of posterity, even should it be so fortunate as to achieve better success than it deserves, he prints this tract, be it understood, not only out of his love for and pride in present Young America, opening its eyes so auspiciously, but to provide a snug little foot-hold in the memory and affections of the emancipated future, so that when the world comes to laugh at and pity the adult Republicans of 1860, some descendant of mine or yours, rummaging an old closet, may discover a little brown brochure, from which he will have some right to infer that his ancestor was not one of that solemn crowd

who, with long faces, first interpreted the Constitution to contradict itself, and then said, or swore, that they felt conscientiously *bound by every word of it!*

To me the Constitution of the United States is a straight-forward, honest, anti-slavery document, which I cannot swear to support without being such an abolitionist as I am, all of which I hope to show before I get through. But first I must ask my reader to go back with me to the political necessities of our nature for which constitutions are supposed to provide.

What is government good for? Some say for glory — good to be proud of, the same as our dear Heenan, if he is good for anything — and the best government is that which comes nearest omnipotence and is able to smash every other. Others say for wisdom and cunning policy, to take care of everybody's business and make it flourish, and especially to make the rich richer. My suspicion is, that acting to this end it is pretty sure to make somebody richer, without making the whole people any richer. People who cannot enrich themselves by an original creation of wealth, and are yet ambitious to use wealth, are so apt to be found in office, that actual producers have not much to hope from government in the long run, except negatively. Their most sensible desire will be to be let alone, and if, without costing more than it comes to, government will also see that everybody else lets them alone, they ought to be, for themselves, satisfied and patriotic. Government has done its whole watch-dog duty, so far as they are concerned. It is not good at finding brains for people, and they happily have enough of their own. Hence they are usually satisfied, and it is only people who lack brains that are always complaining that government

has not *done* enough to promote their interests. But if people are long-sighted as to their own interests, to say nothing of being blessed with benevolent and humane instincts, they will not be quite contented unless government is as innocent and protective towards all other people as towards themselves. They will want the great watch-dog to be faithful to them by its nature and not by accident. A government which does its protective duty with unreasonable exceptions can only be popular with short-sighted people.

In actual practice, governments have undertaken to carry on trade, manufactures, navigation, transportation, agriculture, education, and religion, with more or less success; but in none of these has it not been excelled by private enterprise, so that the only *forte* of government, the main thing it is good for, is to see that people are let alone; in other words, that every one shall do as he pleases, so long as he pleases not to infringe the rights of of others. Success in this is not easy, but possible, and worth more than that in any or all others lines. A government which begins by being just to all under its jurisdiction can of course command the strength, zeal, enthusiasm and very life of all who are out of its few penitentiaries, and consequently needs cover but a small fraction of the world to protect itself against all external violence. Its whole population is its standing army, and every invader knows that that army must be annihilated before even the place where it stands can be conquered.

I have said everybody should be protected in doing what he pleases, so long as he does not infringe the rights of others, and nobody will deny that. But then comes a mighty dispute about what other people's rights are. Are the rights of all equal or not?

Whatever may be true of rights, there is no occasion to deny that the powers of people are very unequal. While some adults are strong as demigods, others are weak as babies; and the force of character is not measured by that of the muscles. As the strongest man is not always the most righteous, it cannot be pretended that strength is the measure of rights, or that might makes right. That principle has been tried in practice, and nothing but chaos comes of it — a state of society which secures the greatest misery of the greatest number, it being difficult to tell which suffer most, the strong or the weak. For my own part, I think that the rights of all are equal in this sense, that one has as good a right to direct his own powers, whatever they are, by his own will, as another; and if a horse had the same nature as a man, he would have the same rights as a man. But not to insist on the term Equality, in regard to rights, I think we shall agree in this, that any being having a moral nature, or the faculty of distinguishing between right and wrong, must have, at least, the right to be righteous. Not, say you, the right to do just what *he* thinks to be righteous. Very well. But in case he thinks rightly—in a plain case, for there are some plain cases, in which all agree — he has a right to do as he thinks, and his right is infringed when superior force forbids him to do it, and makes him the tool of wickedness.

There must necessarily be a good deal of latitude of thought about what is righteous and what is not; or, in other words, what the laws of God, or the principles of truth are. The laws of God are not quite the same for a bull-dog as for a dove. Nor does He probably require the same of a savage as of a civilized saint. Still there

are *some* things about which there is *no* doubt among mankind as applied to human nature in general. There are *some* sections of "higher law" which disinterested people never pretend to deny; and it is about these we are talking, when we say unqualifiedly and most significantly that every man, and every woman, and every little child has, at least, a right to be righteous, and that the government which deliberately allows this right to be taken away, in any one instance, is worthless, or likely soon to become so. I am not so strong as Heenan, nor as Dr. Winship, and my purse would not stand a week of litigation. Nearly all I have for this world or the next is a conscience void of offense, so far as it is so, and if the government under which I live deliberately refuses, in regard to any human being under its jurisdiction, whether higher or lower, blacker or whiter or greyer than I am, to protect his right to be righteous, what security have I that my indispensable right will not be invaded and taken? A government which fails to do justice in a clear case, cannot safely be depended on in doubtful ones. If it will yield, no matter on what pretext, to one strong man the right to compel another weak one to be a criminal, what security have I that it will not cherish crime as well as punish it, and that its crop of injustice will not become as great as that of its justice? Why, its bottom of principle has fallen out, and it matters nothing which end up it stands. It as good as holds nothing for me. I do not feel at home under it. A government, to be good for anything to me, or to be anything but a nuisance, must not willfully do or permit any wrong; it must *begin* to see justice done, and go on seeing justice done to absolutely everybody, at least so far as the cases

are perfectly clear and indisputable. When the slightest mist of doubt arises (though it may be clear enough to me) to anybody that is in no particular danger of the penitentiary, then I am ready to be charitable and deferential. We were fools to expect perfect justice of imperfect men. All I ask of a government is, that it shall do justice as far as it knows how, with as little cost as may be to my pleasure, and that it shall not, cost what it will, do or allow any *known* injustice which it has power to prevent. It must n't swear to do it. And if it does swear to do it, it must *undo* the oath. Don't you agree with me in that? O, my most fortunate reader, I know you do. This is the Alpha of your politics, if not the Omega. It is the big A of everybody's politics who does not make politics a means of defrauding other people. Every honest man who enjoys sense enough to understand his own interests, will agree that I have stated the most important test of a good government, and that no form or name can recommend one which cannot stand it.

So much for the abstract principle. If it is true, you can no more build a good government and allow chattel slavery under it, than you can build a good house contradicting the abstract truths of geometry. A house-builder may never make a perfect right angle, nor set a pillar absolutely true to the perpendicular, but he must come as near it as he can. If he wilfully departs from his abstract mathematics the laws of gravity will revenge themselves in the end. With these remarks, so true that I am afraid you are drowsy, I ask you to approach the question which politicians cannot repress.

The adjective negro is supposed by many to have vast significance and importance in defending the question from the abstract principles that were professed by the founders of our government. They, it is argued, were white, or rather non-negroes, and settled their political mathematics exclusively for their own complexion. To me the adjective seems of no consequence. Slavery can no more be permanently hedged in, dammed up, or stopped from flowing on to the general result of making all laborers the property of capitalists, by an adjective of color, than Niagara can be impeded by a rainbow. But granting it could be, in a technical sense, its mischiefs must diffuse themselves none the less in the future, just as they have in the past. If two men compete in the labor market, each asking for his work the highest price he thinks he can get, and you catch one, and make him work for less, say nothing and costs, you damage the other, or I am no Yankee. What difference, in respect to this damage, does it make, if the one caught happens to have red hair or long heels? or anything of that sort? Still less does it make any difference as to the applicability of the abstract principle of the right to be righteous. As long as that top-light of Caucasian intellect, Caleb Cushing, concedes a moral nature* to the negro, let him be placed as near zero in the scale of human beings as even that illustrious office-holder pleases. His right to liberty under law is none the less real, while the duty of

* The overseer concedes this even in his mode of punishment. A teamster does not flog his horse the day after his tantrums. It is after a day of probation that the short-weight cotton picker gets "hell."

government to protect it is enhanced by his very humiliation, this duty being always more imperative the more people are unable to protect themselves.

So far as they themselves and their pure white offspring were concerned, there is no question but our fathers, in founding their democratic republican system of government, in both its state and national jurisdictions, proceeded on the principle that the weak as well as the strong, without regard to accidents of birth or difference of qualities, were to be protected in the same freedom before the law. And there is no more question that this system of government to this extent has worked well. Very weak and low people, and even some very black people, have enjoyed liberty under it as fully as the superlative Caucasian, and no more harm has come of it, perhaps less, than comes of such people with less liberty under other forms of government. If, then, our fathers failed to apply their principle as extensively as it is applicable, that principle being not only logically and necessarily true, but practically demonstrated, it remains for us to do it. The experiment, even in its imperfect state, has electrified the world. There is no room for doubt that, under fair conditions, the veritable thing would go on rejoicing down the tide of time, till the memory of hereditary government and privileged governing families and classes or castes would fade to a myth.

But whether the fault is that of the fathers or of the children, or of both, the experiment has not been fairly tried, and is now in the very jaws of failure. In the national phase, at least, the form of government does not at all express the fact, and it is a long time since it has done so. It is a slavocracy; or, if you like it better, a

nigrocracy. The power which works the form is a compact class—owners of human beings, whom they like to have us call "niggers," as if that term was itself a conclusive argument for their slavery, as, in fact, it is the strongest. It is almost needless to adduce proof of this since the explosion of the dominant party.

But look at two or three facts and be certain. Property in slaves was fenced out of certain territory by law. To conciliate its owners this law was repealed, and to satisfy its opponents it was enacted that the question of slave property or not should be left to the sovereignty of the squatters. The squatters of Kansas voted NO, in capital red letters, and showing teeth of steel, refused eternally to reconsider. Neither Buford's men, Clay Pate, Love, Money, or U. S. Dragoons, could make them vote otherwise. Neither J. B. bogus ballots, candle-boxes, or Cincinnati directories could make the decision otherwise, Those squatters have knocked in vain for admission to the Union! Would they be kept out if slave owners did not rule us? Do those owners look likely to make a squatter-sovereignty president? Don't they insist that their property shall now be protected, wherever they please to carry it, against squatter sovereignty, cost what it will, and that the national government shall continue on no other condition? When they say they will ruin us if they can't rule, it is evident enough they would, long ago, have tried to ruin us, if they had not enjoyed the privilege of ruling us.

Now let us see what is the effect on us, average white people, not negroes at all, of this actual government of the slaveholders. Under those State governments in which the slaveholders are supreme, the great majority of the

white population are reduced to comparative poverty by the unjust competition of slave labor, and kept in barbarous ignorance because liberty of the press and free schools are dangerous to negro slavery. Do you believe there is any such thing as freedom of the press in a Slave State for an average white man? Offer to circulate Helper's book and see. That is not a book written in behalf of negroes at all, but in behalf of white freemen against the injustice of the negro-owners. It professes to give facts to show how slavery injures the white non-slaveholders. The facts could not be answered, and because they were facts and could not be answered, the slaveholders who so beautifully work the national government, imprison or lynch any man who is caught circulating the book in a Slave State, and combine against any northern politician who endorses it in a Free State. The injuries and indignities inflicted on white non-slaveholders in Slave States —to say nothing of their utter want of political power, for their right of suffrage never practically amounts to anything more than a choice between candidates of the dominant class—could not be catalogued in a dozen Helper books. The government they live under is practically and really worse to them than the Neapolitan is to any class under it. Indeed it would be difficult to name any people of any age or country who suffer or have suffered so much from bad government, as the average non-slaveholders of the South do from the supremacy of the Nigrocracy. This comes naturally and inevitably from the prostration of the one vital right to be righteous. The inexorable law on the soil of every Slave State, to every white man, high or low, is, BE MEAN, CRUEL AND WICKED TO THE NEGRO or **DIE.**

Do you suppose that abject submission to such a law for two or three centuries, or even a quarter of a century, will not damage a people in mind and body? Can there be in all the Slave States enough righteousness by stealth to keep up a comfortable degree of self-respect? The most intolerable consideration about this tyranny is, that it has degraded the people, I mean the white people, almost beyond the disposition to rebel. It has destroyed every noble ambition and left only an insane and hopeless desire to own "*niggers.*" Whatever, much or little, the wrong done to the actual slaves may be, the wrong done by slavery to the white non-slaveholding population of the Slave States is the greatest which bad men or devils were ever permitted to do within my knowledge. What it amounts to, statistics, like those of Helper, can never adequately inform us. No man can guage it without travelling with his eyes open in both Free and Slave States; and any man who has travelled in both, without having both his eyes and his ears shut, may safely be appealed to to testify that the wrong is incalculable. A conquest by an invading army, or two or three of them in succession, is nothing to it.

The slaughter of a whole population of Christians, like that in Syria, is not so terrible an evil as one which, while it does not wholly destroy the population of a country, makes Christianity impossible. Sacking full grown cities is bad enough, but what shall we say of a curse which keeps cities from growing, and condemns half a continent to the occupancy of cowards—two classes of them, suffering in eternal fear of each other, without any possibility of that mutual confidence of class in class, by which alone the arts of civilized life can l-

developed. War destroys the results of human labor. Slavery destroys the motives of it. The sword cuts off a brave life and decides a mere question of time. Slavery brutalizes and makes mean everybody and every thing connected with it. The old Romans had any amount of courage, so that they robbed the whole world and brought home its wealth—slaves included. The slaves ruined all—courage included. Rome was blessed by conquest. As slavery grows strong every noble thing grows weak. The whole southern country groans to be delivered from a curse. It cries bitterly from the squalid hovels of "crackers" and "sand-hillers"—poor white (aye, Caleb, *white*) "trash" for something or anything that will stop the chattelizing of men, however black. Leave it to the chattelizers?—them only?—the men of all the world least likely to give any relief? Who says so?

Why, my sensible reader, does any man ever wish to own a "nigger"? Is it not to get that done for him which otherwise he would have to pay somebody, free black man or free *white* man, for doing? And if every man who is rich enough to own a slave is allowed to have one, or as many as he can get possession of, is there not an end of trade between capital and labor? Can negro slavery, or any kind of slavery, exist then without depressing the price of free labor in the world's labor market? And can the price of labor be depressed without making those who have labor to sell poorer? Supposing then, and it is a very unreasonable supposition, to which neither the nature or history of man gives any countenance, there is no danger that the slavery institution which has ruled this country will ever extend beyond the negro,

the damage it is doing to the free white people, is reason enough why it should be utterly exterminated by the shortest possible process. As free-trade between capital and labor is the only foundation of a permanent and self-propagating civilization, and as honesty is always better policy for all parties concerned than fraud or rapine, not even the slaveholders themselves can be injured by conceding human rights to negroes. Revert to the red ink of history, and coolly drop the plummet in its hyperbolical oceans of blood, and you will perhaps be surprised to find that no war ever yet did any country so cruel a damage, moral or physical, as that demonstrated by Helper's book as done by negro slavery to the Slave States.

This fact, written in the squalid poverty and contented ignorance, of some eight millions of white non-slaveholders, inhabiting the Slave States, is deserving of incessant repetition. Yes, my gentle reader, you may be as much horror-sticken, shocked, and shuddered as you please, but it is nevertheless as sure as the eclipses, that any conquest, however bloody, and to be succeeded by any government, however despotic in form, which should rid our whole country of all chattel slavery, would be a blessing to it. Slaughter is transient, and elastic nature soon fills the gap. Governments, whatever their form, must in spirit be the creatures of the civilization which prevails among the people. An evil institution which perverts justice and destroys industry is an eternal slaughter, a perennial death and desolation. It poisons the milk of human nature. It converts the life of a nation into a loathsome disease. If we want a union and common constitution for anything, or ever could want it for anything, it

is to put an end to such a perversion of government as this, and secure for States, under the heel of faction, what they cannot secure for themselves. When the Southern Representatives in Congress were men who honestly intended the extinction of slavery, and the enjoyment of liberty by all, the Southern States were participators in the Union, which was formed on the avowed principle of securing liberty to all. But when they ceased to be so represented, they in fact were crowded out of the Union, and only the usurping slaveholders, who contrived to be elected *a la Napoleon III.*, remained in it. If the Federal Government cannot extrude the usurping slave power, and re-admit the veritable States themselves, then indeed is the Constitution worthless.

I ought here, perhaps, to interrupt the course of my argument to say that I am not playing, and am not going to play the censor. I am talking about an "institution," not about persons. The slaves, slaveholders, and poor whites are respectively just what I should have been, placed in the conditions of either class—in the average, perhaps, better. The last thing in the world I mean to do is to anathematize any of them. It is useless; worse than that—cruel. Personally, I pity them, and so do you. All we have to do is to consider the best thing to be done to put an end to the circumstances—the "institution"—which make them all victims, and *to do it.* Talk won't do it. It has no tendency, except very indirectly, to do it. One can easily imagine, how, if one had the power of the nation in himself, or even if one were only a John Brown, and that John Brown a Garibaldi, he could lay his hand on the shoulder of the nigrocracy and say, "You are my prisoner; let us have justice at once,

or you go along with me;" and the vision of lead and saltpetre would be enough, with little or no actual bloodshed. Soon after that you would hear of land selling in Virginia and North Carolina for fifty dollars an acre; Negros and Hibernians buying small parcels, and paying in day's work; poor white men looking up on flourishing trades, and even some of the first families, enjoying the unheard-of luxury of being out of debt. But Brown has left no successor, and Garibaldi is otherwise busy. Even the million-headed nation itself, so long as it feels, as it does by some incomprehensible spell most fanatically feel, forbidden by its venerable constitution, cannot do any such thing. It has a respect for laws and constitutions, which, great as my own is, surpasses my understanding. Law is manufactured annually, and a constitution is a law about laws, made, we will say, once in a thousand years, the only assignable object of the whole being to secure justice, and its sequel—joy. These means are respectable and venerable according to their success, and are generally, whether wholly successful or not, worthy of being submitted to with patience and philosophy till they can be altered for the better. But I cannot agree with the great lights of the age in statemanship and jurisprudence, that if a law should be constitutionally passed requiring every citizen to skin his grandmother alive on her arriving at the age of eighty, it would be worthy of patience or obedience; or that the national government, after having been administered for half a century in plain violation of the constitution and all its objects, to promote the interests of slavery, can be bound by any clause or the want of any in that instrument to allow that destructive essence of meanness, cruelty and wrong to flourish

peacefully in the States which it has usurped, so that it may again rally for the ruin of the country. A constitution might, doubtless, have been made which, grammatically and in terms, should have forbidden the general government to provide for the general welfare, and secure external and internal peace, in case it should become certain that the general welfare could not be provided for, nor peace be secured at home and abroad, except by putting an end to slavery in the States. But our fathers did n't do it. I think they would not have done it if anybody had asked them to. Moreover, if they could have foreseen that slavery would continue in existence so long, I think they would have been ready, by an overwhelming majority, to give Congress power utterly to abolish it as early as 1860, just as they did give it power to abolish the slave trade in 1808, every one of them supposing that such abolition would be the death blow to slavery itself.

Now the undeniable fact is, that not one of the thirty odd State Governments was framed on any other profession than that of protecting life, liberty, and property impartially, and not one of them ever claimed as an attribute of State sovereignty the right to do otherwise, that is, to do wrong. Wherever slavery exists in any one of them, it exists in spite of the dominant principles expressed in its constitution, and if these constitutions do in any terms authorise legislative acts initiating or sustaining slavery, then they do it as self-contradictors; that is, since the general purpose must govern details, and things refuse to go tail-foremost, they really don't do it at all. Hence slavery in every Slave State, without hair-splitting or pettifoging, and unless slavery was the purpose and rule, and liberty the accident and exception,

exists only unconstitutionally, and by fraud. Such were the governments of the States when the Constitution of the United States was framed, not by a mere confederation of States, but also by the people of all the States, as one people, for the general purpose, clearly avowed, of seeing justice established and liberty preserved throughout the entire Union and common territory. The fraud of slavery was then almost universally admitted, No one pretended that State sovereignty could do any thing but abolish it. And because State sovereignty solemnly promised to abolish it as soon as the details of difficulty would permit, the Federal Constitution did not clothe its functionaries with any express power to abolish it. But State sovereignty having failed to realize the presumption on which the Constitution omitted the special grant of power, and what is worse, and more and altogether to the point, the slaveholders having usurped the control of their own States (*vide* Helper), and made war on the inhabitants of the free territories, to extend their usurpations beyond State limits, the general powers of the Constitution come into play, and must peremptorily abolish slavery in the several States, or the Constitution is an utter failure. The people reserved to their several State Governments the right to do certain right things — which if you are curious about you will find described beautifully in the common Declaration of Independence — without interference from or responsibility to the general government as to the mode of doing them, and this is the whole of State sovereignty. But fearing that their peace and liberty might not be fully secured from domestic and foreign foes by separate State Governments, the people, as equal co-inhabitants of one country, ordained a government on

purpose to do every thing of that sort, which the State Governments should not do. This government, if there is any common sense, honesty, or practical vitality at the bottom of our Republican *E Pluribus Unum*, was solemnly bound by the very motive expressed in the preamble of the Constitution to have peremptorily abolished slavery the moment it found that the several States would not. The trouble was not want of authority in the Constitution, but that the cunning slaveholders got control of this government, and wielded it to protect their peculiar property, even before they ceased to profess that they were going to abolish it by State sovereignty. If the advocates of free labor and impartial liberty succeed in wresting it from their grasp, they will not only have the full warrant of the Constitution to secure domestic tranquility in the only way in which it can be secured, but they will be under the mountain-high added obligation of self-preservation, not to permit the existence, *either in the Union or out of the Union*, of an impregnable fortress into which the hordes of slavery propagandists may retreat whenever discomfited in their felonious forays to refresh themselves and commit further depredations, to say nothing of the sacred obligations of our common humanity. Till the general government—no matter what party administers it—earnestly undertakes to do this (in default of the Slave States or slave-masters), anybody is justified, and a good deal more than justified, before God and the universe, in undertaking, as brave old Ossawatomie Brown did, to do it himself. If any consequential animalcular unit of God's living world swells up with patriotism and horror, and denies this, I only ask the slight privilege of

looking him straight in the eye for about one minute. If it should be Senator Mason who complains of it, I would remind him of an easy and safe way out of all the dangers and difficulties which he has so ably demonstrated in his Harper's Ferry Report without being able to discover any possible escape. Liberate your slaves. You, and your fellow slave-holders, Mr. Mason, condescend to be honest, and you will be happy, or at any rate safe from John Brown, Jr.*

*If Senator Mason will recur to the record of his name-sake, Col. Geo. Mason, perhaps his own ancestor, and certainly one of the profoundest lawyers and ablest men that Virginia ever produced, he will see that he is suffering only what that distinguished man foretold as the inevitable consequence of indulging in human chattels. Mr. Madison embalms a wonderfully comprehensive speech of this Col. Mason in the words following. "Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labor when performed by slaves. They prevent the immigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen a country. They produce the most pernicious effect on manners. Every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant. They bring the judgment of heaven on a country. [Harper's Ferry invasions and the like !] As nations cannot be rewarded and punished in the next world, they must be in this. By an inevitable chain of causes and effects Providence punishes national sins by national calamities."—*Madison Papers, vol. 3. p.* 1391.

Out of the United States the question between John Brown and the State of Virginia is by no means so clearly settled against him as our advocates for loyalty to wicked law seem to suppose. Not fanatics only, but business men take his side. It is remarkable that foreign journals, even those specially devoted to trade and market statistics, such as seldom take notice of any question out of their own line, stepped aside when they heard of the hanging of John Brown to give the verdict of their peculiarly unsentimental common sense on the case. For example, *The Banker's Journal*, a favorite publication on the London Stock Exchange, had an editorial in its issue of January 14, 1860, in which it said : "History will write John Brown's name on her imperishable page, and delight to tell future ages that when slave-abetting priests offered him their unhallowed consolation in the very jaws of death, he bravely refused to acknowledge their right to be the disciples of him

Perhaps the plain principle that, when government neglects so plain a duty as the protection of the right to be righteous, any man may righteously, if not safely, undertake to do it, the best way he can, will be more intelligible to some people if we take the case of property. We will suppose the right in property, say in sheep and poultry, is as carefully guarded in State Constitutions, and over that in the United States Constitution, as liberty. But in a certain State, certain men combining carry sheep-stealing and hen-roost robbing into politics so effectually that nobody's property, of that kind, is safe from

who came to proclaim liberty to the captive, and to open the prison doors to them that are bound. That passage in his noble reply, 'I would rather die surrounded with a slave mother and her children, wafting my spirit on the wings of faith and prayer to the presence of God, than accept your ministrations,' has something in it closely allied to inspiration ; and if the alternative were offered, we would rather accept the position of John Brown, either on the scaffold or at the bar of heaven, than that of his murderers, who have cruelly (legally if they please) put him to an ignominious and unrighteous death."

Let justice be done though the heaven should fall is the honest old saw. But if justice is done, it is not heaven nor earth that will fall, but the other place, which will merely settle to its own proper level. The practical difficulties of emancipation are not with the emancipated to secure order and industry, but with the class that has been accustomed to rule and get served without giving a proper compensation, to keep *them* from continuing the old trick under a new name. There is always difficulty in making free people work for nothing. If negroes will not work for fair wages, there are enough white people who will, and keep the negroes from stealing into the bargain. Proprietors of productive estates never yet, on this planet, had any difficulty in finding laborers to work them at a fair price, though they often groan because laborers are not plenty enough or foolish enough to enrich them faster by beating each other's wages down. A Yankeeg uesses that the owner of a rice plantation would n't have to give his negroes more than nine-tenths of the crop to get it well cultivated, and seeing that nobody but a negro can work in a rice-swamp and live, why should he give less ?

their clutches. They take all they can find, and hand over to the jailor under legislative acts every owner that resists. And the Federal Government finding nothing about it in the enumerated grant of powers in the Constitution, listening to a clamor about State rights, refuses to interfere. Who is going to blame either the sheep owner who shoots the marauders in the act, or his benevolent friend who volunteers to do it for him? Yet a slave's right to cherish his own wife and be a father to his own children is clearer than any body's right to a sheep or a shanghai.

I confess, therefore, so far as I am concerned, that I could — and if I could of course I would — vote to put an end to slavery in every State incontinently, and do it on the happiest possible terms with the much abused Constitution itself, and the dear ghosts of the men who made it. If I believed the Constitution did in some subordinate clause forbid it, I would in so much abjure the Constitution and do the same, thinking the general welfare and salvation of the country better than a self-contradictory and inadequate piece of parchment. And if I believed, as some people profess to, that the Constitution does consistently and *bona fide* guarantee slavery, and I had sworn to it, I would abjure. I am not very hard on oaths, sacred or profane — they have their uses and great uses — but I do not think an oath binding people to be unpatriotic and wicked, as well as foolish, *in secula seculorum*, is worth keeping. You do? I am sorry. But I will not quarrel with you about it. People generally think so. I suppose the Republican Party almost entirely thinks so, with such a ten-thousand horse-power of conscience, that it will shudder at my heresy, and per-

haps request me not to vote its ticket. I shall, if I live, vote its ticket nevertheless.

The Republican party also thinks the fugitive slave law a law which requires every northern man, in a certain contingency, to be not only outrageously unrighteous, but ineffably mean ; to be, if not a constitutional enactment, at least endurable, and worthy of being endured, till, in some dim hereafter, when we are all ghosts, our children's children shall have virtue enough to repeal it.*

*This law is so palpable an infraction of the Constitution, even granting the common pro-slavery interpretation of that instrument, as well as utterly subversive of state rights, that one can hardly yield to those who acquiesce in it any credit for loyalty either to the Constitution or the sovereignty of the States. What are political guaranties good for, that may be trampled on in this way ? One would have supposed that the entire north, without distinction of party, would have spit upon and defied it, to say nothing of insisting on its instant repeal. Indeed it is quite amusing to look back now and see how shrewd politicians did sieze on it, and expect to make immense capital by telling the exact truth about it, as a violation of even a pro-slavery constitution. Prince John Van Buren, not believing the North so craven and besotted as it turned out to be, supposed he could endear himself to the country by pitching into the handiwork of the Compromisers as follows. I quote from a speech in Burlington, Vt., in 1851.

" There is another question which has arisen since the last Presidential election, and which was in no degree involved in that controversy. I allude to the Fugitive Slave Law. On a recent occasion I stated the reasons why I believed that law to be perfectly unconstitutional. They were briefly these :

First—That Congress had no power to legislate upon the subject.

Second—That if they had the power, the law was unconstitutional, because it did not give a party seized under it a fair trial by jury, at the place where he was seized.

Third—That it suspended the *privilege* of the writ of *Habeas corpus* in a case not excepted by the constitution.

Fourth—That the tenth section condemns a person conclusively to the

Here is a law which has the fiendish impudence to come and offer to demoralize me and my children and turn us all into sneaks, too mean to endure ourselves, backed up by formidable pains and penalties and all the federal power This goes its whole length precisely and entirely against *my own* right to be righteous. It aims, in the midst of this christian country, amidst the echoes of the golden rule and the Lord's Prayer, to make me a devil, of whom hell itself would be ashamed. If the fugitives were innocent ex-monarchs, or honest millionaire financiers, or Caucassian dandies, particularly ingenious and good looking, who did n't owe the tailors a red cent, the extradition would be wrong enough and mean enough. But when I am called to re-iron a poor, ragged, sunblacked, "inferior" negro, who is confessedly the creditor of his pursuer for much hard work done, for which he utterly despairs of ever getting pay, and has run off among strangers purely

deprivation of his liberty, in his absence and without any hearing or notice to him.

And I added, that as the law was unconstitutional, I should resist it with all the means I could command if seized under it.

* * * * * * * *

If the law is unconstitutional, I had supposed that no judge or lawyer who has any respect for himself, would pretend that it should be obeyed.

All writers upon law agree that an unconstitutional act is no law ; it is a nullity, and is to be treated as such, alike by citizens as by courts. But it is said that an individual has no right to judge whether a law is constitutional or not. This I deny. He should and must judge. He judges at the risk to be punished if he errs. Suppose a law should be passed by Congress, authorizing the first three Union Hunkers who meet me, to put me to death. The law would not fail in the state of New York, for the want of execution. (Laughter.) Who is the judge of the constitutionality of this law ? Am I to wait till after the fact, to have the question tested by the courts ?"

to acquire the right to be righteous, and his unconscionable *debtor* pretends to claim him under a constitutional clause which secures only the rendition of persons who owe service or labor, I confess, with the utmost alacrity, that I shall be proud to do everything in my power to defeat the law and the pursuer. And I am happy to believe you would. And, thanks to God and the irrepressible instincts of humanity, almost everybody at the north would. But, inverted thanks to the lawyers and political teachers, Republican as well as others, these same people, when they come to reason about the matter, get awfully muddled, and cannot justify their own most honorable, righteous, and humane instincts. More than ninety-nine out of a hundred of them will tamely acquiesce in the conclusion that, in point of expediency and "*law*," they *ought to be* meaner and wickeder than they *can be*. The great Republican leaders and the great Republican party, church members, deacons and parsons included, admit this to be so before the universe, if I understand them. Now, of all the mysteries in the universe, and I see plenty on every side, the greatest mystery to me is that any northern man or party should have been able to find, or should have had any disposition to find, either a natural or legal reason for any fugitive *slave* law, whether the equivocally worded one of '93, or the naked unblushing one of '50. I cannot begin to divine how any citizen of a free State could endorse the bare and base insult of the latter for one individual minute, or how any man, with half a teaspoonful of brains, could ever believe there was a warrant for any thing of the sort in the Constitution of the United States,

or fail to believe that the entire spirit of the Constitution forbids it. I can no more fathom this mystery than I can the blue ether, but stand confounded and dumbfounded, doubting whether the people I see really exist or are phantoms due to some mirage of the medium through which I am looking. I cannot ignore myself altogether, if I try. And there are *some* parts of my very limited knowledge which I cannot ignore, though the first men of this earth and of the fixed stars, should command me to do it. The said first men will, of course, wilt my mere opinions and theories into becoming modesty. But when they come down, with their majestic wigs, upon my little stock of *real knowledge* and begin to contradict and crush out that, "I say stop, illustrious gentlemen, if you succeed you don't convince, you annihilate me. *I* don't consent to be annihilated." The great majority of my northern brethren, whose hearts I verily believe are all right, seem to me to have consented to have their heads annihilated so far as concerns this question, and stand up to-day with precisely so many turnips at the apices of their vertebral columns. In the multitudes of cases where back bones really exist, such an unworthy coronation of them is truly deplorable.

As for me, if I exist intellectually at all, and know any thing through the medium of my mother tongue, I *know* — not surmise, think, opine, but *know* — that the Constitution of the United States does *not* authorise a national or require a State fugitive slave law. That Daniel Webster, and other statesmen, have admitted a part of this proposition no more confirms or fortifies it in my belief than their avoirdupois weight confirms to me the law of

gravity. I am happily not indebted to their weightinesses for any such knowledge, but to the fact that I have senses, understand English, and am not a fool. On this particular question, I do not certainly know, but I almost believe, that, *with a fair chance,* I could effectually teach a turnip, planted on a sound spine, throbbed against by a human heart, to *know* that the proposition is true in *both* parts. I do not ask you, gentle and indulgent reader, to let me try on you, for you are not a turnip, or you would have turned away from this discourse long ago, and if you were one, the process would be too long for my limits. But I ask you to let me indicate very briefly the apparatus I would use if I were to try the experiment. It will consume little of your time to point my finger at the logical posts which mark and make the way to absolute conviction. You can visit and examine them all at your leisure.

All slave catching "under the Constitution," as you are aware, hangs on a well-known clause, or rather the supposed *claws* of that clause, which *claws*, as every body knows, if they exist at all, are so concealed under the velvet fur that nobody, but a lawyer, would ever have discovered them. To the English reader the whole provision applies only to some fugitives or other who are just the reverse of slaves, that is, fugitive *debtors*, pursued by their *creditors*, not to fugitive *creditors* pursued by their *debtors*. Plus and minus, heaven and hell, are not more thoroughly distinct.

Nobody, worth mentioning, pretends that the language of the Constitution *by its own inherent significance,* requires a law for the rendition of fugitive slaves. The doctrine is that such significance belongs to it from the

history of the time in which it was made, and because it must mean something, and would not have been worth making to mean only what it says, and because it has been held for a venerable length of time to mean only fugitive slaves. It would be easy to quote the mightiest lawyers to show that meaning cannot be injected into Constitutional law by history, when its language has a natural significance of its own, and that written constitutions would not be worth their ink if it could. But I will not waste your time, or my own, to do it. The eternal muse of history is not dumb on this topic. When the babble of the age is silent, and time has obliterated the spurious scrawls of self-interest, there will stand plainly recorded, as with diamond on jasper, substantially this as the birth-record of that marvellous and mischievous little clause.

After all the rest of what have been called the "Slavery Compromises" had been settled in the Constitutional Convention two or three slave-holders were dissatisfied, because they could see nothing in the Constitution which recognized the existence or the right of property in slaves, so carefully and purposely had terms descriptive of human chattels been excluded. They therefore cast about to get inserted some clause which would express or imply the existence of slavery, and its legality. Up to this point of Colonial history there had been two great classes of people in servitude in this country, of nearly equal political importance, the Africans, who were chattels, and the Europeans, who were held to service for life, or for limited terms, chiefly for money advanced to pay their passage from Europe.*

* See Hazard's State Papers, Plymouth Col. Records, Massachusetts

The latter class was nearly extinguished by the revolution, the men having been taught in the previous French war to seek liberty through military service, generally secured their freedom by enlisting in the Continental Army. But the class had not entirely ceased to be. Every body was familiar with it, and legislators by no means ignored it. It had attracted their notice as far back as 1643, when it was enacted in a sort of New England Congress, that servants escaping from one jurisdiction to another should be delivered up. This was before Africans arrived in New England. The class, in fact, always gave great trouble by its fugacity, as in fact the negro slaves did not, to any mentionable extent, till about thirty years after the revolution. At the very time

Bay Records, Young's Chronicles, Drake's Hist. and Antiquities of Boston; Documents of the Colonial History of New York; Hildreth's History of the United States, Sparks' Life and Writings of Washington, all the ante-revolutionary newspapers, &c., &c., *passim*. Take for example the *Boston Newsletter* of one hundred and fifty years ago. Its few advertisements are as likely to be of Runaways as anything, and these are not only of blacks and mulattoes, but of English, French, Dutch, Swiss, &c., &c. Here is a sample verbatim.

"Ranaway from his master *Mr. Joshua Gee* Ship Carpenter in Back Street Boston., On Monday Last the fifteenth Currant a servant man named *James Crage* a North Britain, aged about 22 years, of a middle stature, well sett brown hair has on a Kersey Jacket, brass buttons and leather breeches, he returned on Saturday last from the late expedition in Capt. *Long* and belonged to Capt. *Barker* of the Honourable Col. Vetch's Regiment.

Whoever shall apprehend the said runaway and him safely convey to his said Master or give any true intelligence of him; so as his Master may have him again, shall be sufficiently rewarded besides all necessary charges paid." *Newsletter*, *Oct.* 22. 1711.

About every other paper contains a fresh notice of this sort. The records of courts are full of assignments of such property. The public authorities made nothing of lending constables to whip recaptured runaways, white as well as black. Our fathers were a pretty hard set.

when the Constitutional Convention was deliberating in Philadelphia, the Confederation Congress in New York, in legislating to exclude both slavery *and* involuntary servitude from the Northwest Territory — referring distinctly to these two classes, for the legislator did not use the word *or* — provided that the latter class — persons owing service or labor — when escaping from one of the original thirteen States into the Territory should be delivered up to the claim of the creditor.

History, musing long and deeply, acquits that Congress of the slightest consciousness of design to recognise the right of property in slaves by that provision, or to provide at all for their rendition. It meant just what it said, and no more. To return to the Constitutional Convention, the two or three mal-content slaveholders, after having cast about as has been said, proposed to insert in the Constitution just after the clause about fugitives from justice, which had been copied from the old articles of Confederation, where it stood alone, a clause requiring fugitive *slaves and servants* — notice the two distinct classes (slaveholders offering to roll logs with servant masters!) — to be returned like criminals. The convention flared-up. The ball rebounded. Wilson of Pennsylvania, who had himself been a redemptioner, objected! No, no, horses as soon, shouted an old Connecticut shoemaker.*

Neither Mr. Madison nor any one else has probably furnished a full report of what was said, but it is plain enough from Madison that the proposition was hooted out, for the movers were glad to stop debate by withdrawing it. The next day they came forward again, but

* See Madison Papers, vol. 3. pp. 1447, 1456, 1458, 1589, and 1620.

with nothing about slaves. This time they had substantially copied the proviso from the aforesaid ordinance for the government of the Northwest Territory, by which fugitives owing service or labor were to be delivered up when justly claimed by persons belonging in any of the thirteen original States. Very well, said the Convention, we understand that; lick it into such shape that it shall give no moral support to the right of property in slaves, and take it and make the most of it. It will do no harm if it does no good—so it passed with the framers *nem. con.* into the draft which was to be submitted to the people *to be made a Constitution by their votes.* They voted for or against it as they understood it, and they understood it only as it spoke for itself. The framers of the draft had always deliberated with closed doors, in carefully secret session, and what they meant by any article could only be known to the people by its language, and by such explanations as individual members chose to give. In all the Northern States, whose conventions first voted on the Constitution, explanations were abundantly called for and abundantly given, especially in relation to anything which seemed to concede advantages to slavery, but in regard to the clause about the surrender of fugitives from labor no explanation was either volunteered or asked! This shows that all the northern constitution-makers voted to surrender debtors to creditors, not slaves to slaveholders. If anybody had even suspected that that clause authorized the surrender of slaves, it would have been objected to, and a strong fight would have been made on it. No candid and intelligent student of history can doubt that if the opponents of the Constitution in Massachusetts

had known that this clause was inserted to gratify the desire of the South Carolinians, that the Constitution should somehow or other concede their right of property in slaves, and enable them to hunt runaway slaves in Free States, they would have got it rejected by a more decided majority than that which adopted it, to wit fourteen votes, nor would he have much doubt that such a rejection would have been fatal to it.

Moreover, we positively know that when the draft was, at a later date, submitted to the conventions of the southern States, in at least two very important ones it was opposed by the advocates of slavery because it did *not* recognize the right of property in slaves, or *make any provision for their recapture.** Madison, in Virginia, and Iredell, in North Carolina, met this objection with the "southern face," which has been found so convenient by multitudes of politicians since. They said, Gentlemen, a clause was inserted expressly to please you and South Carolina on this subject; and though it does not say slaves, your rights are perfectly secure under it, as a practical matter. You can use it as long as slavery lasts. The profound lawyer, George Mason, in Virginia, after Mr. Madison's ingenious explanations, re-examined the clause, and said he did n't think it had any such effect. The objectors grumbled and submitted, and there abstractly and practically, the question rested till about A. D. 1820. In the mean time, when Congress was moved, in 1793 to legislate in regard to the rendition of fugitives from justice, from a mere sense of thoroughness, it extended its act, which passed entirely without debate, to embrace fugitives from labor—not slaves—using simply

* Elliot's Debates, Vol. 2, pp. 335, 339; Vol. 3, p. 157.

the phraseology of the constitution. And this is the celebrated Fugitive Slave Law—or half law—of 1793.

Negroes are naturally the least migratory and fugacious of all races, and do not seem to have given their masters much trouble by yielding to the attractions of the North Star, till the generation that made the Revolution and the Constitution had passed away. In one unrecorded case a slaveholder arrested a fugitive slave in Boston, and found a cunning attorney who proposed to get a warrant for his removal under the then recent Act of 1793. But as soon as the people discovered what was going on, the prisoner was rescued from the process before the magistrate had a chance to decide whether the law could apply to such a case or not. So far as the records show, the Act of '93 was first applied to fugitive slaves by Philadelphia lawyers, about thirty years after its passage. Pennsylvania judges sanctified the interpretation, and no judge anywhere seems to have remembered, if he ever knew, that it could apply to any other class, so utterly had the old "involuntary servitude" of emigrants sold by captains for their passage money—European Coolies, so to speak—ceased to exist! The class for which the proviso in the ordinance of 1787, copied into the Constitution and legislated on abstractly in 1793, was designed, and to which alone it was adapted, being *in articulo mortis* at those dates, was, in fact, never alive enough after 1787 to require its operation. By 1820 the memory of that servitude had perished, and it is now one of the curious *incredibilia* of old records. By 1820 slavery had become a power in the country, capable of buying northern statesmen to counteract northern instincts and opinions. By that time the south was the

prevailing wind, and as it continued to blow harder and harder, with a particularly enervating influence, the judicial tree-tops leaned, and the wigs of the tallest judges were easily swept into the current decision, that the Constitution could mean by debtors of service nothing but slaves, and that it was one of the solemn "compromises" on which the Union rested, and that all humane instincts, and sentiments, and theories of State sovereignty must govern themselves accordingly!

So much for the teachings of the real history, if it should ever be written. It gives no pro-slavery meaning to the Constitution, and very reasonably explains why the fugitive clause should mean just what it says.

But let us suppose the history were somewhat different. Let us, in fact, suppose that emigrant servants had never existed, and that the only thought of the framers was to make a provision for the re-capture of fugitive slaves, and let us still further suppose that the ratifiers of the Constitution understood it so to be. That generation passed away and no use was made of the provision. Another came, and then first the question arose. The slaveholder appealed to the instrument. The language itself gave him no support—just the reverse. It could afford none without giving it an interpretation at war with the express purpose of the instrument. It could afford none without robbing the Free State of its sovereignty. A constitution ordained expressly to establish justice, cannot have an unjust meaning historically injected into its just terms, which shall bind a generation that had no hand in ordaining it. If the ratifiers, when they said debtors shall be delivered to creditors, meant that creditors should be delivered to debtors, and we ad-

mit that their own meaning was binding on themselves, it does not follow that it is binding on us. We, their successors, have minds of our own. When we acknowledge ourselves bound by the constitution as an organic elementary law for the establishment of justice, and accept it as such, that is as far as we can go. We cannot be bound to accept along with this a contradictory historical interpretation, even though by rejecting it we should reduce a clause of the Constitution to mere surplusage or dead letter. This is plain common sense, against which precedent, tradition, law craft, and thunder-head wigs, never prevailed in the long run, and never will.

I ask you, reader, as an integral unit of a free State, to suppose, with me, an entire absence of constitution, and that we are now sitting in the place of our Fathers to decide what the constitution shall be, and just how much *justice* will allow us to concede to co-states as the price of union or co-empire.

We choose to found our own State government on as near an approach to the principle of human equality as this, that every human being within our boundary, who is righteous before our laws, shall be let alone by us; moreover that he shall be protected against every other individual within our boundary in his admitted right to be so let alone. Shall we allow an alien to do what we will not allow a citizen to do? Shall we allow a co-state to do what our own State cannot do? Just as soon resolve government into chaos. When the dog who had in charge his master's dinner-basket consented to allow other dogs to taste—of course he fell to, himself. Why should n't he? I say, compact or no compact—swear to

what Constitution it pleases, a government that consents to the extradition of an innocent person,—that consents to have an unjust act committed on its soil, is not a free government, but a servile and subject authority or a tyranny. The plain, and I might say self-evident, truth is, that a government can consent to extradition only when the subject is justly amenable to the same consequences under its own laws. Only the criminal in the eye of its own law can be given up. Only the debtor who would have been a debtor by its own laws can be given up, and only on such proofs as its own laws require. It cannot be guilty of the injustice of delivering a creditor to a debtor, because some other government sees fit to reverse the definitions. When we, in confederating the States, agree that persons, owing service or labor *under the laws of any State*, escaping into another State shall be surrendered to the claim of the creditor, if we mean righteously, we proceed on the assumption that the laws of debt and credit are substantially alike in all the States, as in fact they are. We cannot suppose that a man will be held to owe service under a law which compels him to serve without a consideration, that is, without owing, unless we suppose that we are confederating with pirates. A man *may*, doubtless, in an arbitrary sense be held to service or labor by the laws of a State, though the mere fact that he has been claimed, driven, bought and sold as a slave is no proof of it, but supposing him held a slave by law, he is surely not the person whom we can agree to surrender, for, consistently with our principles of just government, that person must be surrendered to the claimant "to whom the service is *due*." It is a mere abuse of language to say that service which is

doomed by law when a consideration and personal consent do not exist and never did, is "*due*." Such an interpretation of that word would turn our Constitution into the death warrant of State liberty. It not only concedes to aliens what government has no right to do itself, but it practically relinquishes the right to protect its own citizens against foreign usurpation, and makes a concession which nations always have refused till they were conquered.

If authority were required on this point, I might cite Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, one of the very men at whose instance the provision for extradition was extended to embrace fugitives from service and labor. In 1799, Jonathan Robbins, a native born citizen of Connecticut, was delivered up by Judge Bee, of the U. S. District Court of South Carolina to the British authorities under the 27th article of the Jay treaty, which provided for the extradition of persons charged with murder or forgery, on such evidence as would authorize their commitment for trial by the laws of the place where they might be found. Robbins was charged with participating in a murder which was committed while he was serving as an impressed seamen on board the British vessel Hermione. Mr. Pinckney published two memorable letters, severely censuring Judge Bee for consenting to this extradition, for many reasons, and in the course of his remarks laid down principles in regard to the duties of government and the rights of individuals which are perfectly fatal to the interpretation which makes the fugitive clause applicable to slaves. He not only claims for the republic the right to receive expatriants from other countries, but asserts the duty of protecting them, and cen-

sures the Jay treaty for conceding the extradition of persons charged with murder, to a government engaged in foreign wars, and in the habit of impressing seamen. Under such a treaty, an oppressed man, committing homicide in defence of his right to liberty, might be pursued, and dragged from his asylum to suffer death from a court martial. Very humanely he tells us, "We must never forget that in this country, the poor and the rich, the humble and the influential, are entitled to equal privileges; that we ought to consider a violation of the rights of the most indigent and unprotected man as an injury to the whole; while we have a pen to guide, or a voice to lift, they should be constantly exerted against the exercise of tyranny or oppression, by whatever nation committed, or to whomsoever the violence may be done."

Vindicating the poor Yankee Sailor in this spirit, he elaborates an argument which would have vindicated him none the less, if he had been born an Irishman or a Tartar. With great clearness and force, he establishes it as both international and "higher law," that any man, born anywhere, has a right to be where he pleases, and to be protected there. [Any other doctrine, it is almost superfluous to remark, Mr. Pinckney seems perfectly sensible, turns the people into some king's or priest's, or Kaiser's, or society's, or planter's cattle, or property, though he does not say that in so many words.] Says Mr. Pinckney, after citing the highest authorities, ancient and modern, "The result of these opinions is, that among the ancients, the right of a citizen to quit his country when he pleased, was unquestioned. That among the moderns, the right is admitted at all times, except at a conjuncture when 'he cannot abandon it without doing

it a remarkable prejudice,' that is, in time of extreme danger, when an enemy has actually invaded the country, or is about immediately to do so." Moreover, Mr Pinckney held that the humblest subject had a right to expatriate himself, in spite of any laws his country might make to the contrary, for he says, "That it is a privilege founded in the law of nations and reason of things; and that the laws of Great Britain, Russia, and other countries which differ, are unnatural infringements of a right, their Creator must have intended, *every human being to possess.*"

Granting the individual right of expatriation, which if true between all nations, must much more be true between the confederated states of a free republic, and the duty of every State government to protect from all harm every person within its jurisdiction who is not charged with anything that is criminal in view of its own law, there is, obviously, no room left for the extradition of fugitive slaves. It is morally impossible. Sitting to make constitution, we cannot concede it without the folly of sacrificing the end to the means—justice, liberty, ourselves—to comity. We cannot concede it without complimenting our co-states as organized piracies, and ourselves as being willing to confederate with pirates. The utmost that we could, honestly, and honorably, do in this direction, is what our fathers did, supposing that by the fugitive clause they meant only what its language imports, the surrender of certain debtors to certain creditors.

Now, if the federal Constitution were yet to be made, is there a judge in any Free State, save ex-Judge Caleb Cushing, or any lawyer, save, perhaps, Charles O'Conor, Esq., who would dare tell us that Free States could deliver

up fugitive slaves, or any otherwise recognize and enforce slavery on their soil? Would such a proposition be tolerated for one moment by the self-respect and wisdom of the people of the Free States, to say nothing of their justice and humanity? You and I know well enough it would not be. We know that both reason and instinct would reject it. We know that the righteous and the wicked would vie with each other in rejecting, refusing, and hooting the proposition into everlasting banishment and contempt. And are we now, nevertheless, to accept as a constitutional duty, the extradition of slaves, not because the Fathers unequivocally ordained it in the Constitution, which they could not do without making the Constitution flatly contradict itself, but because judges and lawyers have made it constitutional by a magical process of juridical interpretation, in spite of such contradiction? Is the world with the printing press and the free slate in its hands, to be forever humbugged by its learned professions, and made to disbelieve its own knowledge, and barter its own natural sight for a second-hand faith which contradicts it? You, kind reader, may venerate and deferentially bow to such lawyers and judges, if it pleases you. I recognize a certain consistency of such homage with the good order of society, and so forth, but for me, I only admire them as I do magnificent soap-bubbles, and *quoad hoc*, rely on them in the same degree. Vast talents and capacities, they and their craft, doubtless have, for making white look black, but not enough, in my opinion, for the permanent obfuscation of genuine, free, American citizens. I don't know how much legal lore and profound judicial dignity it would require to ennoble that act of Judas Iscariot for

which he hung himself for shame, but I do know it would require a great deal more to take the meanness out of the act of any citizen of a Free State who participates, however legally, in betraying and securing to his claimant a poor negro slave. The more legality, the more shame in it. In addition to the inherent native scoundrelism of the deed itself, the man who helps in it under the cloak of law, reproaches his state and his country, as capable of descending to such loathsome injustice in its most solemn and deliberate moments. May the everlasting curse of Noah upon his irreverent offspring rest upon me, if I do anything to accuse our revolutionary fathers of requiring such a law, or anything to countenance the thought that iniquity so profoundly mean can ever be required by legislative authority. I leave it entirely to others to uphold the majesty of law by committing the cruelest and meanest of crimes under its forms.

When I swear to be faithful and true to the good old house of our liberty under law, I swear to it from the underpinning upwards, straight up without turning and am not going to have any part of my oath made void by some crooked cornice that has been spliced on of purpose to furnish accommodations to thieves, rats, owls, and other plunderers of the common weal. I am not aware that anything more need be said about the Fugitive Slave law.

Though there is no reason to be very proud of a party which at least tacitly admits that, either by the presumed injustice or blunder of a former generation, we are bound to do evil, and in fact make hounds of ourselves, and which only humbly aspires to save so much of liberty as the perfidious violators of the Constitution, after having

had their own way for half a century have pleased to leave us, yet as it really does love and mean to defend that remnant, it is comparatively noble. The opposing factions, however they may differ, all agree in this, that they set no value whatever on that remnant of liberty. The least pro-slavery of them meekly if not cheerfully bows to the supremacy of the slave driver's Supreme Court, when that Court spits on the Constitution and the laws of God. Still they all *talk* constitution in the most devotional tone, of course meaning to support that patriotic formula so far as it tends towards the omnipotence of money—counting all the rest "glittering generality." They have not the slighest quarrel with the dogma—or rather bull-dogma—that capital ought to own labor, but in this latitude, unlike bull-dogs, they have not the pluck to avow their faith in it—excepting one Irish lawyer.

The greatest recommendation of the Republican Party is, that its enemies do not quite believe its disclaimers, while they do believe that it is sincerely opposed to slavery as far as it goes. And so it is, and noble would it be, and on to the entire victory would it go directly and irresistibly, if it had not a servile, sneaking sort of faith that its best instincts are wrong, unpatriotic and unconstitutional. Its men are too meek, modest and womanly. If their amazing delicacy could only be tempered with some of the brazen impudence which characterizes the pro-slavery parties, what a glorious deliverance the country would soon have! To this, it is to be feared, it will only come when still further bullied, spit on, tarred, feathered, caned, robbed and murdered by the nigrocracy, and then the said nigrocracy will have become so thoroughly established in the habit of reigning by terror that

it will take some blood to settle the conflict. It is almost idle to imagine that the inevitable revolution can come without violent destruction of human life, but good and humane people will deeply consider under what conditions that destruction will be reduced to a minimun. After thirty years watching the progress of this question, I can conceive of no conditions that would result in a bloodless settlement except a dominant party in possession of the Federal Government with a grand arrogance in favor of liberty, to the extent of interpreting the Constitution as good to establish liberty and justice in every State where it is not established in this year of gospel 1860, and of Independence 84. Such a party, glorying in its strength, and still more in its noble and just purpose, would by its very coming into power inspire such prudence in the breasts of the refined and enlightened owners of slave property, that far from seeking to empty their sanguiferous vessels, they would be taking good care to replenish those auriferous ones which slavery usually keeps in a depleted state, by exacting as much "compensation" as a generous government would allow. This solution is peaceful and happy, but unfortunately imaginary. Its only use is as a test to the actual, possible conditions which are struggling in the womb of the immediate future for leave to exist. It shows that the more prompt and thorough the friends of liberty are in their claims and action the less costly their victory.

Now let us turn to the actual conditions that are about to be, and not supposing, like ostriches, that we can abolish danger by sticking our heads in the sand, consider the consequences that are likely to follow one or the other set.

On one side are three or four pro-slavery factions, not essentially differing among themselves as to the end, but rather bitterly as to the means. All agree in wishing to maintain the *statum quo*, that is, the domination of the slave power, but do not agree as to the rapidity with which the black juggernaut shall be driven over the prostrate rights of free labor. The vitality is manifestly all in one of these factions, that which drives fastest, and has the furies harnessed in its team. The others are mere collections of slaves, grown unmanageable by fright at the signs of waking up in the camp of freedom. It is needless to ask what would take place if either of the tremulous, half-and-half parties should win power, for no such event is possible. If the victory is on that side it will be won by the party which openly avows that slaves are property, and are protected as such by the Constitution, wherever and as much as it protects any other property. In that case the irrepressible conflict is transferred to the soil of the Free States. For mind you, sorely as that party needs votes, and has occasion for the politic wisdom of the serpent, you do not catch it disclaiming the right to carry negroes into Free States, and hold them there, and take them away whensoever and wheresoever the owner pleases. Never they such fools as to humiliate themselves and throw away their prestige by any such weak twaddle. On the contrary, when it comes to the proper time, they will refer you to abundant precedents, Lemmon cases and the like, in which they at all times distinctly claimed the right to carry their slave laws, as well as their slaves, along with them to every hill and valley, city and hamlet, of our "common country," and no "Democratic Platform," of a national stamp, though

penned by "Liberty-all-over-God's-heritage" Hallet, ever had a line to the contrary.

Now any man who supposes that a sectional party, founded not merely on a geographical section, but on that particular moral section of the country which holds to exacting work without pay, can bring its doctrines and practices into the Free States, and commence protecting slave property therein without finding occasion to let blood, must think more meanly of human nature in general, and northern human nature in particular, than I do. I deem it entirely probable that the Presidency of Lane or Breckinridge, if we are doomed to either, will result in a general war between the Federal army and the insurrectionary forces of the Free States, which will result in the total defeat of the former, and the conquest and re-annexation of the Slave States with their peculiar institution missing. This will be purchasing the great blessing at its maximum price. I had rather reduce the price, even at the expense of time. The end could not be much bloodier, if deferred, and the chances are much in favor of its being less so.

Though the Republican Party is so meek in its spirit as to concede away the vitals of its cause, though it does not justify the holiest and noblest instincts of human nature, and makes itself contemptible with its foes by undertaking to keep its "prejudices" conquered and do their dirtiest of dirty work, though it creeps sneakingly along towards the grandest victory in the annals of time, with a ludicrously blind imitation of timid Jacob's device, driving a herd of disclaimers and concessions before it as a peace offering to an Esau that never relented and never will till every Jacob is his bondsman, its success,

in the coming election, is more probable than that of the other party, and it is more important to ask what will result from such success.

Not the abolition of slavery anywhere, of course. Not any particular check to the extension of slavery, for that is already held in check by the instincts of individual men who dare to call their souls their own, and vindicate their right to be righteous, in spite of law, or party. Finally nothing at all in regard to slavery in a direct sense, except, perhaps, a little more facility in the manufacture and admission of Free States.

In regard to the ordinary working of the government machinery, there will doubtless be a great and valuable gain by the introduction of the honest, thrifty methods of the Free States, in lieu of the Iscariot-like system of corruption which has always been found necessary for nigrocratic administrations. As to the irrepressible conflict, the Republican party only aims to put into the presidential chair, a good and naturally competent man, reduced by the Constitution, interpreted in a pro-slavery sense, to a mere lay figure or automaton, from which, slavery has really nothing to fear. If it can only have the sense to put up with Mr. Lincoln's financial reforms, take its share of the offices, pocket its pay, and bide its time, it may be really safer than under any other possible administration, seeing that all the dangerous instincts of honest Abe and his party are thoroughly chained up against everything aggressive and practical. The grand battle-cry of the Republican Party, and the modestest battle-cry which history records, is, "Restore the policy of the Fathers," not one mother's son of them seeming to think that the said policy of the fathers was an experi-

ment which history is obliged to record as the most signal of all failures. It was carefully and ably arranged, conducted with all possible caution, and turned out by putting the republic into the clutches of a full grown ogre which, at the inception of the experiment, might have been pinched out of existence with the thumb and finger. I know the Fathers meant well—far better than some, who would repeat their experiment, are willing to admit—but if they do not look down from their upper spheres with something like self-reproach for their weakness and want of political foresight, then is annihilation not so undesirable. Restore their policy, eh? They left the pitiful little ogre cub to itself, trusting it would die. We all know what it has been doing. We propose, restoring "the policy of the Fathers," to leave the full grown animal safe in his blood-stained lair, and suppose it will be quite innocuous! O! the policy of the Fathers! The best thing we can do, is, to go backwards and throw an old coat over that.

Suppose the government restored to the policy of our fathers, and the slaveholders should be cunning enough to restore the policy of their fathers too. All is peace and gushing courtesy, millenium come again, for four years. Then, or at longest in four years after, you will see the federal sceptre in the hands of some niggerarch again, with the advantage of swaying it over a moral sentiment much lowered in its tone by the natural growth of wealth and luxury. It is only in a line like this that the Calhounites have any right to look for the ultimate success of their darling proposition, that capital should own labor.

But I confess, in spite of this possibility, I persuade myself that the slaveholders of to-day are not wise enough

to restore the policy of *their* fathers, and in this is all my hope, and my ground of satisfaction at the prospect of electing a Republican executive. When I see them insane enough to confess the truth of Helper's book by their rage against it, and get every body to read it, by using Congress for two months to advertise it, I hope every thing from their folly. Abraham Lincoln, it is to be remembered, was born in a Slave State, of the same class of people as Helper. He was crushed under the heel of the great despotism, and, happily for him, was, in a geographical sense, crushed out. He may have been too young to know what crushed him out, but as he has risen by the labor of his own hands, and not by that of slaves, he must have a certain sympathy with that class at the South, who, as being the most numerous, if not the most susceptible of cultivation, suffer from slavery more than the slaves themselves. At all events, from this simple circumstance, slaveholders will hate him with even more virulence than they could the Senator who has the credit of first demonstrating the Irrepressible Conflict. His selection seems typical, and ominous of a resurrection and insurrection of the millions of common white men, politically dead and forgotten under the feet of the slaves and their masters. The bare thought of *such* an insurrection drives the slaveholders mad beyond the reach of hellebore. The thought cannot be laid with Lincoln in the White House, loyal as he may be to the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. It will provoke them to acts of resistance to his administration, and that will introduce the Federal bistoury to the cancer. The salutary process once commenced in that quarter would be short, if judiciously managed; and as Mr. Lincoln is

more at home there than most northern men, he would be likely to see it done well and thoroughly, once having, in his own judgment, "constitutional" power to do it. Wo to the slave power under a Republican President if it strikes the first blow. I have already indicated the woful plight of the Republican party and the country if it don't, and need not repeat that. To me, however, the chances seem so great that slavery, piqued beyond its moderate endurance, will strike the first blow, and thus make the Republican Party as good an Abolition party as could be wished, and will keep striking till the Republican Executive is obliged to strip it of the whole cause of quarrel, and thus terminate the irrepressible conflict at far less cost than it would be terminated under a pro-slavery administration, that I feel bound by all that is human in me to support the cause of Lincoln and Hamlin, so far as I can do it without suppressing what I believe, and especially what I *know* to be true.

A NIGGER MEL-LADY,—GOOD, WHETHER NEGROES ARE "PERSONS" OR NOT—TO BE SUNG IN SILENCE.

TUNE—*Come take a horn of this dilemma.*

There was a man, in Sleepy Valley,
Who owned a powerful farm,
He ploughed it with his Peg and Sally,
And ploughed it to a charm.

O, such a team, since horses grew,
Was never seen for legs,—
They had but six between the two,
And four of them were Peg's!

But Sally was the owner's nag,
His special favorite.
For lack of legs she did n't lag,
Her trotters were all right.

Her owner kept her colts for sale,
For that he loved the pelf,
And, O forgive the shocking tale,
He sired the best himself.

The neighbors knew the ugly fact,—
Mankind and cattle mixed!
And years and years their brains they racked
To get the matter fixed.

But 'twan't so easy as 'twould seem,
They said, to fix the plan,—
The owner of that precious team
Was SUCH a gentleman.

At last these statesmen thought it well,
And wise unto a charm,
To let their neighbor sire and sell—
BUT ONLY ON HIS FARM!

HOW THE UNITED OLD HUNKER PARTY FLEW AWAY TO A WARM CLIMATE.

A nim prophetable for the disconsolidate.

The Hunkers were a heavy set,
A loggy, leaden lot,
That crushed us, as a tavern debt,
Or night-mare does a sot.

"O Lord how long,"—it was our cry,—
"Must this dead weight be borne?
With shears of sham-democracie
Must sheep of thine be shorn?"

"BE SHEEP NO MORE," a voice replied,
So loud that we awoke.
Our manhood grew, and then our pride
The spell of ages broke.

And yet there was but little fuss;
We spoke one sober word,
And straight the hippopotamus
Was changed into a bird.

The hideous bulk became two wings—
What could the wonder mean?—
At first, they seemed but idle things;
No body was between.

But soon a dinner-bell was seen,
Whose handle was a plume.
It rung and wrote, the wings between,
And raised some little fume.

To that the wings on either side
With mighty magic grew,
And then the creature, flapping wide,
To warmer regions flew.

A POSTSCRIPT ON THE POSTOFFICE.

The printer tells me there is room in his last form for a little more. I was going to say to him that I had nothing more to say. Just at this moment I hear that a distant friend, who values the hem of the humblest humanity more than all the hoards of the mint, on receiving a letter from me the other day was quite wrathy at being obliged to pay a cent, although the letter bore the legal stamp of prepayment. I had dropped the letter carelessly into one of the little iron boxes which belong to U. S., without noticing that the boon which we owe to the ingenuity and enlightened zeal of City Postmaster Capen had been taxed into a nuisance by U. S. Postmaster Holt. The said Holt is not so big a fool as not to know that the little iron sub-post offices, cent-free, more than earn their cost by increasing correspondence. But the slavocracy are glad of the pettiest and paltriest insult that can be given to the Free North and especially to the Northern cities, so Mr. Holt applies to the little iron boxes the old stereotyped policy of U. S. Post Office administration of biting off its own nose. This little instalment of the immense convenience of cheap postage and free delivery which Great Britain has enjoyed for

twenty years, and proved to be profitable to the government as well as convenient to the people, must be taken away, by a Federal Department which never yet showed half the zeal to serve the public which it has shown to violate the Constitution, by taking away the constitutional right of the people to carry their own letters, or send them by whom they please.

This puts me in mind of some footings I made the other day on Postmaster General Holt's Report (36th Congress, 1st Session, Senate Ex. Doc. No. 13), about the receipts and expenses of the United States Post Office, from 1840 to the present time, a period of nineteen complete years. I gave these footings to one of our ablest New York Journals, which published them editorially with pregnant comments, and I looked to see figures so full of heavy thunder copied extensively. But I have not been able to learn that any other journal has copied the footings, or even noticed the Report itself. Perhaps the noise made about Helper's book has made the Republican journals timid about copying statistics so damaging to the slavocracy. If figures ever told the truth, or any part of it, these figures of Postmaster General Holt confess and demonstrate that the hundred thousand or so of slaveholders in the United States are one great vampire bat, which, fastened on the neck of our modern civilization before morning, is now sucking blood by the millions of gallons in broad daylight. The havoc made of the finances of the Post Office itself is, of course, nothing compared to the robbery committed on all other human interests, of which it is an index. Balancing fifteen free States against fifteen slave States,

I find the United States Post Office has received and expended in nineteen years as follows:

IN FREE STATES.

	Receipts.	Expenses.
Maine,	$2,465,378 40	$2,474,841 07
New Hampshire,	1,551,255 52	1,470,476 49
Vermont,	1,527,203 50	1,703,084 64
Massachusetts,	8,346,202 53	5,673,914 39
Rhode Island,	956,334 60	563,370 51
Connecticut,	2,781,648 54	2,325,313 30
New York,	21,647,896 55	14,346,286 73
New Jersey,	1,712,280 61	2,007,934 37
Pennsylvania,	9,705,604 48	7,552,833 07
Ohio,	7,193,240 17	8,283,009 86
Michigan,	1,975,353 62	2,625,644 85
Indiana,	2,462,551 76	3,325,273 65
Illinois,	3,760,743 12	5,544,043 03
Wisconsin,	1,546,984 19	1,618,626 34
Iowa,	1,015,833 11	1,356,640 04
Total,	$68,648,510 70	$60,891,292 34
Excess of Receipts,	- - - -	$7,757,218 36

IN SLAVE STATES.

Delaware,	$335,104 70	$337,990 13
Maryland,	2,994,370 57	4,041,847 43
Virginia,	4,007,538 39	6,002,772 40
North Carolina,	1,370,280 11	3,830,452 89
South Carolina,	1,861,080 99	3,426,488 71
Georgia,	2,696,182 72	4,709,790 83
Florida,	397,282 60	1,266,473 75
Missouri,	2,195,683 69	3,588,471 93
Kentucky,	2,348,780 74	3,467,857 09
Tennessee,	1,842,716 47	2,872,547 36
Alabama,	2,155,103 00	4,997,827 62
Mississippi,	1,524,769 29	3,175,431 89
Arkansas,	477,256 22	2,139,877 62
Louisiana,	2,632,994 76	3,811,314 98
Texas,	710,467 43	2,875,271 55
Total,	$27,549,620 68	$50,544,416 18
Excess of Expenses,	- - - -	$22,994,795 50

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.

SHELF No. .....

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY.

Central Department, Boylston Street.

One volume allowed at a time, and obtained only by card; to be kept 14 days without fine; to be renewed only before incurring the fine; to be reclaimed by messenger after 21 days, who will collect 20 cents, beside fine of 2 cents a day, including Sundays and holidays; not to be lent out of the borrower's household, and not to be kept by transfers more than one month; to be returned at this Hall.

Borrowers finding this book mutilated or unwarrantably defaced, are expected to report it; and also any undue delay in the delivery of books.

***No claim can be established because of the failure of any notice, to or from the Library, through the mail.

The record below must not be made or altered by borrower.